



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,759	03/29/2002	Gerhard Herbig	P/63035-PCT	2761
156	7590	02/28/2006	EXAMINER	
KIRSCHSTEIN, OTTINGER, ISRAEL & SCHIFFMILLER, P.C. 489 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10017			AHN, SAM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2637	
DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/018,759

Applicant(s)

HERBIG, GERHARD

Examiner

Sam K. Ahn

Art Unit

2637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 4, line 4, "QAM components" should be "quadrature components", line 6, "each decision" should be "each of said plurality of decision", line 7, "by different" should be "by said plurality of different" and "the decision" should be "the plurality of the decision". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al.

US 5,872,812 (Saito) in view of MacDonald et al. US 5,504,453 (MacDonald).

Regarding claim 4, Saito teaches a phase error detector (see 1,3,4,5,6,7 in Fig.1) for generating a phase correction signal to correct a phase difference (phase error, output of 3 in Fig.1) between a reference frequency of a voltage-controlled oscillator (see 1 in Fig.1 further illustrated in 21 in Fig.5) and a carrier frequency of a received signal (INPUT SIGNAL) having in-phase components and quadrature components (I_{ch}, Q_{ch}) in a plurality of decision regions (see Fig.2),

the detector generating the phase correction signal (output of 4, note col.6, lines 11-12) for all of the plurality of decision regions (see R11-R18, R21-R24 in Fig.2). Although Saito teaches algorithm to generate the phase correction signal (note col.6, line 61 – col.7, line 33), Saito does not explicitly teach the phase error detector selecting one of the algorithms to generate the phase correction signal for each of said plurality of decision regions.

MacDonald teaches receiving I and Q signals and generating a phase error signal (output of 20 in Fig.1) through the phase error estimator (10), and further selecting one of the algorithms to generate the phase error signal for each of said plurality of decision regions (note col.4, line 47 – col.5, line 64, wherein for each region S0, S1...S7 different algorithms are executed, and note col.6, line 39).

Thus, by incorporating the phase error estimator of MacDonald in the phase error detecting means (3 in Fig.1 of Saito) and provide the phase error (output of 20 in Fig.1 of MacDonald) to the control signal generating means (4 in Fig.1 of Saito), the phase error detector would generate the phase correction signal (output of 4) by said plurality of different algorithms for all of the plurality of decision regions.

The motivation to combine would be that by providing a memory (16 in Fig.1 of MacDonald) and the different algorithms in the phase error detecting means of Saito, the calculation of the phase errors would be provided with minimal complicated calculations and less memory consumption through the execution of the different algorithms (note col.1, lines 26-46 of MacDonald).

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JAY K. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Sam K. Ahn
2/23/06